

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 12-14, 19-21, 24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang (U.S. Pat. No. 5,022,157).

Claims 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 15-16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang.

Claims 1-16, 19-21, and 24-30 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 13, 14, and 21 being independent claims, and claims 28-30 being new. Supports for the new claims 28-30 include specification at page 5, lines 14-20, and Figure 2.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner states that Chang anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Chang discloses an eccentric transmission comprising an imbalance compensation element 2 (FIG. 1); an eccentric element 2 (FIG. 1); at least one ball bearing 31, 34, 44, 45 (col. 1 line 59 to col. 2 line 4, FIGs. 1-2); an armature shaft 11 having a rotation axis (FIGs. 1-2). Of those ball bearings 31, 34, 44, 45, only ball bearing 31 is located next to the eccentric element 2, and the other ball bearings are located away from and not coupled to the eccentric element 2 (FIGs. 1-2). Nevertheless the Examiner alleges that "at least one ball bearing which is coupled to the eccentric element (at 2)" (Office Action page 2, item 1., second paragraph). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's allegation. In Chang, ball bearing 31 is coupled to the rocker arm 3 but not to the eccentric element 2, which is dynamically distinct and separate from the rocker arm 3 (col. 1 lines 57-60; FIGs. 1 and 2). Thus, Chang fails to disclose the limitation of "*at least one ball bearing which is coupled to the eccentric element*" in claim 1.

The Examiner further alleges “a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element (at 2) and the at least one ball bearing lies on the rotation axis” (Office Action, page 2, item 1., second paragraph) without pointing to any page and line or figure in Chang. Applicant respectfully traverses the further allegation. Chang explicitly teaches a transmission mechanism which can effectively eliminate any possible shock waves vertically during a scroll saw blade operation (col. 1 lines 6-10, col. 2 lines 14-17 and 26-31) by having the eccentric element (also known as “upper counter weight”) 2 to rotate eccentrically (col. 2 lines 9-14). Chang hints nowhere any teaching, suggestion, or motivation so that a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element 2 and the ball bearing 31, or any ball bearing, lies on the rotation axis of the armature shaft 11. In a transmission mechanism by Chang, should the center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element 2 and the ball bearing 31 lies on the rotation axis of the armature shaft 11; then such transmission mechanism would be unable to eliminate vertical shock waves during the scroll saw blade operation, and thus be contrary to Chang’s teachings. Chang further fails to disclose the limitation of “*a center of mass of a total system comprising the eccentric element and the at least one ball bearing lies on the rotation axis*” in claim 1.

Clearly, claim 1 structurally differs from Chang.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for claim 1 also similarly applies to claim 13 with respect to Chang.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for claim 1 also similarly applies to claim 14 with respect to Chang.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the above rationale for claim 1 also similarly applies to claim 21 with respect to Chang.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 15-16 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), dependent claims 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 15-16 and 25 are allowable due to their virtue of being dependent on their respective allowable independent base claim.

Regarding new dependent claims 28-30, no known prior art renders the claims obvious.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, namely, Claims 1-16, 19-21, and 24-30, are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,
/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233